DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 872 TM 800 490

AUTHOR Carter, Herman
TITLE Follow Through Title I Expansion Program 1978-1979. Report Number 8043.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Bilingual Education; *Compensatory Education; *Elementary School Mathematics; Mental Health Programs; Parent Participation; *Primary Education; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Achievement; Reinforcement; School Health Services; Staff Development; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); *Project Follow Through Expansion Program

ABSTRACT

The report of the 1978-1979 performance of the Project Follow Through Expansion Program for the primary grades focused on the educational component, parent involvement, staff development, and special supportive services. Classroom observations indicated that while aides and parents worked with groups consisting of 2 to 10 children, in two instructional models, teachers engaged in whole class instruction at least 40% of the time across all options. Cross sectional achievement data indicated that the Total Follow Through Expansion Program (TEXP) performed only as well as its Total Non-Follow Through (TNF) Title I eligible comparison group in reading, but outperformed TNF in mathematics. The specific third grade achievement objective was not attained. Parent involvement showed that most spent their time planning fund raising events. Parents who participated in program-specific activities spent their time assisting in program classrooms. Staff development activities involved 98% of the teachers and aides. Most teachers indicated satisfaction with the services received from supervisory and support personnel. Health data indicated that half of the program children received medical screenings and one quarter had physical examinations. Supplementary mental health specialists from 5 agencies provided direct and indirect services to 372 program children. (Author/GK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191872

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOLLOW THROUGH TITLE I EXPANSION PROGRAM 1978-1979

Report Prepared by:

Herman Carter

of the

Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Report Number 8043

March, 1980

Irvin J. Farber
Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

TM 800490

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. KEAN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter

Mrs. Lawrence Boonin

Mr. Joseph H. Previty

Mr. Samuel H. Rubin

Mrs. Michael Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

Dr. Nicholas E. Trolio

* * * * *

Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, Secretary and Treasurer

Mr. Charles A. Highsmith, Deputy Superintendent of Schools

* * * * *

Mrs. Leontine D. Scott
Director
Follow Through Programs

Miss Constance E. Clayton
Associate Superintendent
Early Childhood Education

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Very Great Thanks Are Due:

Miss Barbara Holden for the supportive services data analysis.

Mr. John McKinney for the parent involvement data analysis.

Mrs. Cleo Figgures for the staff development data analysis.

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on 1978-1979 performance of the Title I Expansion Program in the major program component areas: educational component, parent involvement, staff development and special supportive services.

Classroom observations indicated that while aides and parent scholars tended to work regularly with small groups consisting of 2 to 10 children, especially in Options I and II, teachers appeared to engage in whole class instruction at least 40% of the time across all options. The differences between options were not always discernible. Option specific elements in some cases appeared across options.

Cross sectional achievement data indicated that the Total Follow Through Expansion Program (TEXP) performed only as well as its Total Non-Follow Through (TNF) Title I eligible comparison group in Reading, but outperformed TNF in Math. Higher performance was consistently associated with options 4, 2 and 1 in relation to their specific comparison group's performance. The specific third grade achievement objective was not attained.

Parent involvement data showed that Follow Through Expansion parents had a total of 69,818 volunteer hours in program participation. Parents who joined the Home and School Associations spent the majority of their time planning fund raising events. Parents who participated in program-specific activities spent the majority of their time assisting in program classrooms.

The majority (98%) of teachers and aides were involved in staff development activities during the year. The majority of teachers indicated that they were satisfied with the services they received from supervisory and support personnel.

Teachers felt that staff development activities related to Parent Involvement and Improving the Basic Skills resulted in greater classroom effectiveness.

Health data indicated that as a result of Medical Health Services, approximately half of the program children received medical screenings and 24% had physical examinations. A total of 1,655 medical problems were identified. Eighty-five percent of the problems were referred for treatment. Forty percent of the problems were either treated or still under care by the end of the year.

There were no specific program objectives which related to the medical health area. However, data submitted by the Division of Health indicated that children who needed services were identified and assisted.

Supplementary mental health services were also provided to the 28 Expansion schools. Mental health specialists from five agencies provided direct and indirect services to 372 program children. The mental health objective was completely attained.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	EVALUATION DATA	3
	A. Goals/Specific Objectives Addressed	3
	B. Evaluation Questions Addressed	3
	1. Educational Component	3
	2. Parent Involvement	14
	3. Staff Development	15
	4. Supportive Services	17
III.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	19
	APPENDICES	A-D

EVALUATION OF THE FOLLOW THROUGH TITLE I EXPANSION PROGRAM, 1978-1979

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Program Description

The Follow Through Title I Expansion Program involves 28 schools in Districts 1-7, and ranges from kindergarten through third grade. The program introduced in late Spring 1974-1975 is a direct spin-off from the original, national, Follow Through Program. The two most successful models from the parent program, Behavior Analysis and Bank Street, provide the basic direction for the instructional component. Four model options provide the instructional approach for the program: Option 1, a local adaption of the Behavior Analysis Model, Option 2, a Behavior Analysis/Bank Street combination, Option 4, a local adaptation of the Bank Street Model and Option 5, a Bank Street/Bilingual combination. A parent scholarship program is an integral part of the program, where parents receive a training stipend for classroom participation.

B. Evaluation Techniques

Through the use of instruments developed by the Follow Through Evaluation Unit, information was collected in the areas of classroom practices, staff development, parent involvement and health services. The Classroom Observation Routine (COR), the Staff Development Questionnaire and the Parent Involvement Questionnaire were utilized to gather the required data. Analysis was essentially of a

descriptive nature focusing on percentage distributions within appropriate content categories. City-wide test data were also utilized for the analysis of pupil achievement. The data were essentially analyzed in terms of differences of percentages scoring below the national 16th and at/above the national 50th %iles in comparison with Non-Follow Through Title I eligible children.

C. Previous Findings

Cross-sectional achievement data in 1977-1978 indicated that the Total Expansion Program outperformed two districts in K and 1st grade Math, but not in 2nd and 3rd grades. These results were to be expected, since Title I guidlines restricted eligibility in 1977-1978 to children scoring below the 50th percentile.

Priorities for future staff development, which appeared to be generally well received, included "improving the basic skills", "individualizing instruction" and "parent involvement." Classroom observations revealed an average child to adult ratio of 1:12; but small group instruction was observed less frequently than might be expected. This was probably due to the effects of the Title I ruling which reduced the number of personnel in the program. A total of 82,920 parent volunteer hours were reported for the year, the majority of which were spent in classroom participation. Health data indicated that supplemental medical and dental services were minimal due to contractual difficulties and delays, but that 600 hours of mental health services were provided.

II. EVALUATION DATA/1978-1979

A. Goals/Specific Objectives Addressed

Objectives

1. In at least 2/3 of the Expansion Program schools, third grade pupils in Total Reading on the California Achievement Test (CAT) in February, 1979 will have a smaller percentage scoring below the 50th percentile than the total third grade group in these same schools in February, 1978.
2. In at least 2/3 of the Expansion Program schools contracted mental health specialists will provide consultation to teachers for all children brought to their attention. Consultation is defined as including at least observation of the child in question followed by guidelines for the teacher and/or appropriate referral.

B. Evaluation Questions Addressed

B.1 Educational Component

a. Observed Activities

1. Is small group instruction evident in program classrooms?

Small group instruction was a consistent part of the instructional approach in program classrooms. However, the technique was utilized more often by classroom aides and parent scholars than by the teachers.

All program classrooms were observed with the exception of those classrooms which were staffed with teachers who were new to the program in 1978-1979. The Classroom Observation Routine (COR) which was developed by the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit was used to record and categorize observed activity. Observational data indicated that all classrooms were staffed approximately 50% of the time with a classroom aide and parent scholars.

Across all model options, teachers devoted less than 50% of their time to small groups. Observational data indicated that classroom aides in each of the four options spent the majority of their time instructing small groups consisting of 4-7 children. In Options 1 and 2, teachers utilized the parent scholars in the same manner. In Options 4 and 5, parent scholars devoted 1/3 of their time to assisting individual children as well as providing small group instruction.

2. Are there observable differences that distinguish one option from the other?

The differences between Options were not always discernible. Option specific elements in some cases appeared across options.

The use of reinforcement techniques such as rewards, specific praise, and approval, to bring about the desired behaviors are characteristic of Option 1. Observational

data indicated that the use of rewards occurred approximately 12 times per observation in Option 1 and was nearly non-existent in the other three options. Approval also occurred an average of 9 times during an observation. However, it also occurred frequently across other options as well; 8 and 6 times per observation in Options 5 and 4 respectively.

Token menus and program workbooks are materials which are likely to be found in Option 1 classrooms. Token menus which list specific activities for which children can exchange their tokens (rewards) were only found in 29% of the observed classrooms. However, they were exclusive to Option 1. While program workbooks appeared in 20% of the observed classrooms in the option, they appeared almost twice as often (38%) in Option 4.

Attendance boards, job charts, activity centers, and child-made materials are items associated with Options 2 and 4. Job charts were most evident in Option 2, occurring in 67% of the observed classrooms. They occurred in 40% of the observation in Option 4. Attendance boards appeared in a third of the observations in both options. Activity centers and child made materials were found in over 50% of the observed classrooms in Options 2 and 4. However, they were also extensively utilized in Options 1 and 5 as well.

Environmental projects and diaries were items associated with Option 4. Diaries were found only in that option. Environmental projects were found in Option 4 and 5, and appeared more frequently in 5.

In Option 1, classroom observations indicated that the majority of instructional time during the observational periods was devoted to language arts and reading. While reading activities occurred in 49% of the observations, Math activities appeared in only 19% of the observations. Handwriting activities occurred in 3% of the observations, the lowest of all options.

Option I had the second highest incidence of teaching reading, occurring 2.3 times per observation. Teachers were inclined to devote time to organizing the children for instructional purposes. Questioning the children to elicit the required response was used as an instructional technique. Children in the option had the highest incidence of responding to teacher questions.

In Option 4, observational data revealed that environmental projects were often used as a vehicle for providing instruction. They appeared in 12% of the observation, second only to Option 5. Verbal interaction in the form of teacher reading, and giving information had its highest occurrence in Option 4. Teachers were observed reading to the children an average of 3.5 times during an observational period. The children tended to be verbal also. They responded to teacher questions and

read silently or aloud to a great extent. Children in the option had more approved verbal interaction between each other than children in other options. Children were observed engaging in approved talk in 28% of the observations compared to 11% for Option I, 6% for Option II, and none for Option V.

In Option 2 which combines aspects of Option 1 and 4, curriculum materials and classroom activities of both Options should be reflected. Of the three major curriculum elements of Option I, reading, math, and handwriting, only handwriting and math appeared with any degree of consistency. Reading activities on the part of teachers or children occurred infrequently during the observational periods. Verbal interactions, consisting of teachers' questions, giving information and children's responses, major elements of Option 4, also occurred infrequently in the option. In terms of curriculum materials, Option 2 appeared to be quite similar to Option 4 in the use of attendance boards, choice boards and job charts.

In Option 5, classroom instruction was presented in Spanish and English. In 24 of the 25 classrooms that were observed, a rotating Spanish instructor was teaching an academic lesson in Spanish. In addition, classroom aides taught lessons in Spanish in 20% of the observations.

Ethnic materials were displayed to enhance the appreciation for cultural identity. They were displayed and in use in 68% of the observed classrooms.

Small group and individual instruction was the predominant mode of instruction. Parent Scholars divided their time between both methods. Option 5 had the highest incidence of individual instruction. It occurred in 36% of the observations. Classrooms in general tended to be highly structured with teachers devoting time to organizing classroom activity. Activity centers were present in 84% of the observed classrooms. Children spent the majority of their time responding to teacher questions and classifying information.

b. Achievement

CROSS-SECTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT DATA[1]

Since the Follow Through Expansion Program as of 1977-1978 had to adhere to strict Title I eligibility requirements, comparisons with Total City or Total District performance on city-wide tests were no longer in order.[1] The most appropriate comparison group consisted of Title I eligible children in the city who were not in Follow Through programs (NFT). This section focuses on comparisons with this group.

Basic Data tables for these comparisons across Grades 1-3 are found in Appendix A. Table 1A provides Reading data

[1] Total City or District comparisons included both Title I eligible and non-Title I students.

by grade, Table 2 A Mathematics data. Each table presents basic performance information for (1) each Option [1] within the Expansion Program, and for the Total Program, and (2) each district grouping of Non-Follow Through (NFT) Title I eligible children, and a Total City NFT grouping. Performance information consists of (a) total number of children (Total N) for each grouping, (b) percentages of children scoring below the national 16th percentile (<16) and (c) percentages scoring at or above the national 50th percentile (>50). The data are restricted to Grades 1-3 because Title I identification was immediately available through computerized matching of 1978-1979 citywide test tapes with 1977-1978 tapes. To include Kindergarten would have required manual matching of Fall SESAT environment scores with mid-year test tapes.

In the following, reference will be made to Effectiveness Scores (ES). These are straight forward summary indicators allowing combined below 16th (<16) and above 50th (>50) performance to be applied across grades and subject matter areas. Effectiveness Scores (ES) are defined as: percentages in decimal form reflecting the ratio of actual to total possible occurrences of higher performance when comparing Follow Through Expansion and Non-Follow Through (NFT) groupings. A minimum of 4 percentage points difference was required for Expansion groupings to be considered different from Effectiveness Scores (ES) are listed in the text in Table 1. For

1. Option 1: a local adaptation of the Behavior Analysis Model.
   Option 2: a local adaptation of the Behavior Analysis and Bank Street Models.
   Option 4: a local adaptation of the Bank Street Model
   Option 5: a local adaptation of the Bank Street techniques with Bilingual materials.
   Option 5s: a special Bilingual program.

TABLE 1

EXPANSION PROGRAM, 1978-1979

Effectiveness Scores (ES) For Reading And Mathematics Comparing Expansion Program Performance With Non Follow Through (NFT) Performance (Districts 1-7: D1,2 etc.)

OPTION	DISTRICT (NFT)	Reading (Grades 1-3)		Math (Grades 1-3)		Reading and Math (Grades 1-3)	
		Ratio*	ES	Ratio	ES	Ratio	ES
1	D1	4/6	.67	4/6	.67	8/12	.67
	2	3/6	.50	5/6	.83	8/12	.67
	3	4/6	.67	3/6	.50	8/12	.67
	4	4/6	.67	4/6	.67	8/12	.67
	5	3/6	.50	2/6	.33	5/12	.50
	6	3/6	.50	6/6	1.00	9/12	.75
	7	2/6	.33	3/36	.50	5/12	.42
	D1,2,3,4,5,6,7	23/36	.64	27/36	.75	50/72	.69
	TNF	3/6	.50	5/6	.83	8/12	.67
2	D1	4/6	.67	4/6	.67	8/12	.67
	2	3/6	.50	5/6	.83	8/12	.67
	3	4/6	.67	4/6	.67	8/12	.67
	4	4/6	.67	4/6	.67	8/12	.67
	5	4/6	.67	3/6	.50	7/12	.58
	6	4/6	.67	6/6	1.00	10/12	.83
	7	3/6	.50	3/6	.50	6/12	.50
	D1,2,5	11/18	.61	15/18	.83	26/36	.72
	TNF	4/6	.67	5/6	.83	9/12	.75
4	D1	4/6	.67	5/6	.83	9/12	.75
	2	4/6	.67	6/6	1.00	10/12	.83
	3	4/6	.67	4/6	.67	8/12	.67
	4	3/6	.50	5/6	.83	8/12	.67
	5	3/6	.50	2/6	.33	5/12	.42
	6	5/6	.83	6/6	1.00	11/12	.92
	7	4/6	.67	3/6	.50	7/12	.58
	D,1,2,5,6,7	20/30	.67	22/30	.73	44/60	.73
	TNF	4/6	.67	6/6	1.00	10/12	.83
5	D1	1/6	.17	2/6	.33	3/12	.25
	2	1/6	.17	2/6	.33	3/12	.25
	3	0/6	.00	2/6	.33	2/12	.17
	4	1/6	.16	2/6	.33	3/12	.25
	5**	1/6	.16	0/6	.00	1/12	.08
	6	1/6	.16	2/6	.33	3/12	.25
	7	3/6	.50	2/6	.33	5/12	.42
	TNF	1/6	.16	2/6	.33	3/12	.25
5S	D1	0/6	.00	1/6	.16	1/12	.08
	2	0/6	.00	1/6	.16	1/12	.08
	3	1/6	.16	1/6	.16	2/12	.17
	4	0/6	.00	1/6	.16	1/12	.08
	5**	0/6	.00	1/6	.16	1/12	.08
	6	1/6	.16	1/6	.16	2/12	.17
	7	2/6	.33	0/6	.00	2/12	.17
	TNF	0/6	.00	1/6	.16	1/12	.08
TEXP	D1	3/6	.50	4/6	.67	7/12	.58
	2	3/6	.50	4/6	.67	7/12	.58
	3	4/6	.67	3/6	.50	7/12	.58
	4	4/6	.67	4/6	.67	8/12	.67
	5	4/6	.67	2/6	.33	6/12	.50
	6	3/6	.50	6/6	1.00	9/12	.75
	7	3/6	.50	3/6	.50	6/12	.50
	TNF	3/6	.50	4/6	.67	7/12	.58

* Each Option is compared with each district NFT grouping across 3 grades (1-3) in percentages at or above the 50th Zile and below 16th Zile yielding 6 comparisons per district in Reading and 6 in Mathematics.

** Option 5 is located in District 5 only.

each Expansion grouping in comparison with each NFT grouping there are provided three different ESs: (1) across grades 1-3 in Reading, (2) across grades 1-3 in Math and (3) across grades 1-3 in Reading and Math combined. When an Option is found in multiple districts, these multiple districts are combined to provide a comparison, e.g., for Option 1 compared with districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 combined. An example of an ES in the table is as follows: The first entry under Option 1 is a comparison with District 1 (D1) NFT in Reading across Grades 1-3. Option 1 exceeded D1/NFT in 4 of 6 comparisons (i.e., with respect to below 16th and above 50th percentile performance for each of the three grades) thus yielding an ES of .67.

1. Does pupil achievement in the Follow Through Expansion Program compare favorably with a Title I comparison group?

   The Total Follow Through Expansion Program (TEXP) when compared against Total Non-Follow Through (TNF) had ESs of .50, .67 and .58 respectively for Reading, Math, and Reading and Math combined.

   In Reading, TEXP exceeded TNF in grades 1-3 in percentage of children scoring above the 50th percentile. TEXP was similar to TNF in percentage of children scoring below the 16th percentile.

   In Math, TEXP exceeded TNF in grades 1-3 in percentage of children scoring above the 50th percentile. TEXP was similar to TNF in percentage of children scoring below the 16th percentile with the exception of grade 3, where TEXP had a lower percentage of children scoring below the 16th percentile.

2. Does each option compare favorably with a corresponding District level Title I group?

Each option, with the exception of option 5 compared favorably with its corresponding district level Title I group.

Option I outperformed TNF in 3 of 6 comparisons in Reading and 5 of 6 comparisons in Math yielding ESs of .50 and .83 respectively. It also outperformed its combined Districts (D 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7) in 23 of 36 comparisons involved in Reading for an ES of .64; in 27 of the 36 in Math for an ES of .75; and in 50/72 combined Reading and Math comparisons for an overall ES of .69.

Option 2 outperformed TNF with ESs of .67, .83 and .75 respectively in Reading, Math, and Reading and Math combined. It also outperformed its combined Districts (D 1, 2, 5) with ESs of .61, .83 and .72 respectively in Reading, Math, and Reading and Math combined.

Option 4 exceeded TNF with ESs of .67 and 1.00 in Reading and Math. It also outperformed its combined districts (D 1, 2, 5, 6, 7) in Reading, Math and Reading and Math combined with ESs of .67, .73 and .73 respectively.

Option 5 and 5s (Bilingual options located in District 5) only rarely outperformed TNF with ESs of.16 and .00 for reading, .33 and .16 for Math and .25 and .08 for Reading and Math combined. Option 5 in comparison with D5 had ESs of .16, .00, and .08 respectively for Reading, Math, and Reading and Math combined, while Option 5s had ESs of .00, .16, .08 respectively.

3. Which options have the most positive effect on pupil achievement?

Higher performance was attributable to Options 4, 2 and 1, which consistently exceeded NFT and had overall ESs of .83, .75 and .67 respectively and in comparison with their combined district groupings had ESs of .73, .72 and .69.

4. Did 1978-1979 performance compare favorably with 1977-1978 performance?

In general, the Total Follow Through Expansion Program Reading and Math results for 1978-1979 were lower than the results achieved in 1977-1978. It should be remembered, however, that the School District had two major reorganizations this past year.

A minimum of 2 percentage points difference was required to consider 1978-1979 performance different from 1977-1978. The 1978-1979 Reading results for each option with the exception of Option 5, Grade 2, and Option 5s Grade 1, was lower than the 1977-1978 results. Option 5 Grade 2 had a higher percentage of children scoring above the 50th percentile and a lower percentage of children scoring below the 16th percentile. Option 5s Grade 1, had a higher percentage of children scoring above the 50th percentile only. In Math, Option 5 Grade 2, and Option 5s Grade 3 had a higher percentage of children scoring above the 50th percentile.

The specific objective regarding improved Third Grade performance

was not attained. Improvement in 19 of the 28 schools was required for attainment, only four schools improved over the past year on this performance indicator in reading.

B.2. Parent Involvement

1. What was the level of parent involvement in the program in terms of (a) volunteer hours, and (b) attendance at program activities?

This year, as in the previous years the Parent Involvement Questionnaire was used to determine the nature and extent of parent involvement in the program as measured by: (a) attendance at meetings and workshops, (b) the number of persons and man hours involved in volunteer projects, and (c) the relative emphasis given in meetings to various planning activities.

The Follow Through Expansion Program did not have a parent group with specific program responsibilities. Parents wishing to participate in school activities did so by joining the local Home and School Association associated with their program school.

Data from the Parent Involvement Questionnaire indicated that parents attending Home and School meetings spent the majority of their time planning fund raising events and educational sessions for parents. Time was also allocated to planning social activities and extracurricular activities for the children. Schools reported that parents who had children participating in program activities

provided a total of 69,818 parent volunteer hours with an average of 2685 hours per program site. A total of 6015 of the volunteer hours were devoted to work done at fund raising events. Parents also gave more than 3000 hours to each of the following: classroom participation, class trips, and working at home on school projects.

In addition to their school participation, parents attended a series of monthly workshops which were organized and conducted by the Parent Involvement Coordinator who visited each of the program schools regularly. A total of 19,211 parent hours were spent at 357 workshops across all program sites. A total of 4994 parents attended workshops related to 1 of 7 different areas of interest: (1) educational, (2) policy planning, (3) social services, (4) health and nutrition, (5) careers, (6) personal growth, and (7) other. Workshop related to education accounted for 61% of workshops contacted by the program. They also had the highest rate of attendance.

B.3. Staff Development

1. How frequently do teachers and aides receive staff development in the (form of workshops, meetings, on-site consultations, demonstrations, etc.)?

The analysis of staff development activity was based on the responses from 94 staff development questionnaires representing 64 teachers and 30 classroom aides.

Ninety-eight percent of the teachers in the program participated in staff development activities during the program year. The activities were provided in the form of workshops, classroom demonstrations, and on-site consultations. Fifty-eight percent of the teachers indicated that they attended from 1-5 workshops. The majority (69%) received 1-5 classroom demonstrations. Teachers indicated that on-site consultations were an on-going part of their staff development. Sixty-three percent indicated that they had from 1-15 individual conferences. Sixty-two percent participated in 1 to 15 group meetings. Seventy-five percent had 6 or more years of experience in early childhood programs. Forty-eight percent had three years experience with the Follow Through Expansion Program.

2. How satisfied were teachers and aides with the services provided by resource personnel?

The majority of teachers and aides indicated that they were generally satisfied with the services provided to them by resource personnel. A small percentage (8%) of the teachers were dissatisfied with on-site classroom training and support in working with paraprofessionals. Teachers indicated that resource personnel did an excellent job at giving suggestions about effective use of curriculum materials, conducting group meetings and workshops, and locating available resource materials.

3. What were the instructional staff's priorities for future staff development?

The instructional staff selected five (of fifteen listed) areas as preferred future topics for staff development. The topics selected by teachers were (1) improving the basic skills, (2) parent involvement, (3) learning disabilities, (4) helping children take tests, and (5) making effective use of physical space. Teachers and aides listed Improving the Basic Skill as their first priority. Over half of the teachers (64%) felt that staff development in Parent Involvement and Improving the Basic Skills resulted in greater classroom effectiveness. A third of the staff indicated that they would participate in staff development related to Using Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum, without being reimbursed.

B.4. Supportive Services

1. Were medical/dental screenings accomplished for each child?

Data provided by School Districts Health Services indicated that medical screenings were provided to at least 50% of the children enrolled in the Follow Through Expansion program. Twenty-four percent of the children received physical examinations.

A total of 1655 problems were identified. Forty percent of the problems were related to vision, followed by medical, (36%)(those identified through physical examination), nutrition, (16%) and hearing (89%). Overall, 85% of the problems were referred for treatment. Of that number 40% were either under care or had their care completed.

There were no specific program objectives which related to the medical health area. However, data submitted by the Division of Health indicated that children who needed services were identified and assisted.

2. What mental health services were made available to children in the program?

Supplemental mental health services were provided to 372 children from 28 Follow Through Expansion schools. Contracted mental health specialist from five agencies provided comprehensive services to children, parents and teachers in the form of direct and indirect services. Direct services were related to children and normally consisted of classroom observations, diagnosis and consultation services to parents and appropriate school personnel. Indirect services consisted of staff development, parent education and referral activities.

The specific objective for this area was completely attained. All of the 28 Expansion Program Schools, and not only the 19 required for this objective, received the kind of consultation stipulation from contracts with mental health specialist.

III. Summary and Conclusions

Classroom observations data revealed that classrooms were staffed approximately 50% of the time with a teacher, classroom aide and a parent scholar. Small group instruction was a consistent part of the instructional approach, however, the technique was utilized more often by classroom aides and parent scholars than by the teachers. Teachers devoted less than 50% of their time to small group instruction. In terms of option specific, the difference between options were not always observable. Option specific elements in some cases appeared across options.

Cross-sectional achievement data indicated that the Total Expansion Program performed as well as its Total Non-Follow Through Title I eligible counterpart in Reading. They outperformed their comparison group in Math, and Reading and Math combined. Options 4, 2 and 1, consistently exceeded NFT with ESs of .83, .75 and .67. However, the Total Expansion Reading and Math results for 1978-1979 were lower than the results achieved in 1977-78, and were probably affected by the two major re-organization this school year.

Parents who participated in Home and School activities spent the majority of their time planning fund raising events and educational sessions for parents. Parents devoted a total of 69,818 volunteer hours to in-school activities and participation at workshop organized by the Parent Involvement Coordinator at each school.

Almost 5000 parents attended 357 such workshops. The majority (61%) of the workshops were related to education, and were attended by most of the parents who participated in workshop activities.

Almost all (98%) of the teachers in the program were involved in some form of staff development. Sixty-nine percent of the teachers received from 1-5 classroom demonstrations and indicated that on-site consultations were a regular part of their staff development. Teachers in general were satisfied with the services provided by resource personnel.

Fifty percent of the program children received medical screenings. Twenty-four percent had physical examinations. One thousand six hundred and fifty five problems were identified and the majority (40%) of those were vision related. Of the 1655 identified problems, 1407 were referred for treatment. Forty percent of the problems were either under treatment or treatment had been completed.

Mental health services were provided by five mental health agencies that were contacted to provide supplemental services. Mental health specialists provided services to 372 children from the 28 Expansion schools.

As a whole the program appeared to be functioning as intended, though affected by the two major teacher organizations this past year in the School District.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1A

EXPANSION PROGRAM: 1978-1979

READING

Percentages of Children Scoring At or Above the 50th Percentile and Below the 16th Percentile: Comparisons Between Program Performance and Title I Non-Follow Through (NFT) Performance, Grades 1 - 3, California Achievement Test (CAT).

EXPANSION PROGRAM	Grade 1			Grade 2			Grade 3		
	Total N	>50	<16	Total N	>50	<16	Total N	>50	<16
Option 1	915	50	13	654	36	17	684	16	37
Option 2	257	53	13	201	38	18	218	19	33
Option 4	496	46	15	486	39	16	467	16	36
Option 5	141	35	23	132	37	21	136	3	53
Option 5s	13	31	15	68	24	29	13	0	92
Total Expansion	1822	48	14	1541	37	18	1518	15	38
TITLE I NON-FOLLOW THROUGH COMPARISONS									
District 1 (NFT)	284	44	16	367	29	20	433	7	41
District 2 (NFT)	200	39	11	245	30	20	213	8	35
District 3 (NFT)	26	42	23	40	50	23	47	2	36
District 4 (NFT)	250	45	13	210	31	22	228	10	36
District 5 (NFT)	89	33	18	114	33	11	121	11	36
District 6 (NFT)	71	35	27	171	34	20	147	16	44
District 7 (NFT)	89	27	27	124	33	20	132	17	26
Total NFT (1-7)	1009	40	16	1271	32	20	1321	10	37

TABLE 2A
EXPANSION PROGRAM: 1978-1979
MATHEMATICS

Percentages of Children Scoring At or Above the 50th Percentile and Below the 16th Percentile: Comparisons Between Program Performance and Title I Non-Follow Through (NFT) Performance, Grades 1 - 3, California Achievement Test (CAT).

EXPANSION PROGRAM	Grade 1			Grade 2			Grade 3		
	Total N	>50	<16	Total N	>50	<16	Total N	>50	<16
Option 1	916	55	14	655	38	16	685	30	26
Option 2	262	50	12	207	43	18	218	34	22
Option 4	524	50	14	488	47	14	462	29	23
Option 5	126	48	22	132	42	28	140	11	39
Option 5s	26	27	42	76	25	32	14	36	36
Total Expansion	1854	52	15	1558	41	18	1519	29	26
TITLE I NON-FOLLOW THROUGH COMPARISONS									
District 1 (NFT)	290	37	15	369	28	18	434	20	35
District 2 (NFT)	208	41	20	246	38	20	217	25	32
District 3 (NFT)	24	33	38	40	48	13	45	22	29
District 4 (NFT)	261	40	15	209	29	19	228	18	32
District 5 (NFT)	91	48	16	113	43	12	125	23	21
District 6 (NFT)	74	42	20	178	30	24	147	24	31
District 7 (NFT)	81	35	22	125	34	17	133	33	24
Total NFT (1-7)	1029	40	18	1280	33	18	1329	23	31

TABLE 3A

EXPANSION PROGRAM READING RESULTS: 1977-1978, 1978-1979

Comparisons of Program Performance for a Two Year Period: Percentage of Children Scoring at or Above the 50th Percentile and Below the 16th Percentile, Grades 1 - 3, California Achievement Test (CAT).

EXPANSION PROGRAM	Grade 1						Grade 2						Grade 3					
	Total N		>50		<16		Total N.		>50		<16		Total N		>50		<16	
	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-7
Option I	1156	915	56	50	7	13	967	654	43	36	17	17	888	684	27	16	31	37
Option 2	311	257	66	53	9	13	302	201	37	38	16	18	260	218	21	19	28	33
Option 4	788	496	49	46	14	15	715	486	48	39	15	16	638	467	30	16	29	36
Option 5	120	141	39	35	21	23	219	132	32	37	32	21	245	136	31	3	39	53
Option 5s	41	13	22	31	12	15	50	68	46	24	18	29	53	13	15	0	40	92
TOTAL EXPANSION	2416	1822	54	48	10	14	2253	1541	43	37	18	18	2084	1518	27	15	31	38

TABLE 4A

EXPANSION PROGRAM MATHEMATICS RESULTS: 1977-1978, 1978-1979

Comparisons of Program Performance for a Two Year Period: Percentage of Children Scoring at or Above the 50th Percentile and Below the 16th Percentile, Grades 1 - 3, California Achievement Test (CAT).

EXPANSION PROGRAM	Grade 1						Grade 2						Grade 3					
	Total N		>50		<16		Total N.		>50		<16		Total N		>50		<16	
	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79	77-78	78-79
Option I	1162	916	61	55	9	14	983	655	43	38	21	16	900	685	37	30	26	26
Option 2	307	262	64	50	10	12	300	207	49	43	13	18	262	218	40	34	21	22
Option 4	790	524	52	50	17	14	712	488	52	47	15	14	635	462	41	29	20	23
Option 5	124	126	49	48	15	22	223	132	39	42	22	28	246	140	36	11	28	39
Option 5s	41	26	34	27	20	42	51	76	37	25	16	32	53	14	26	36	23	36
TOTAL EXPANSION	2424	1854	57	52	12	15	2269	1558	46	41	18	18	2096	1519	38	29	24	26

SUMMARY TABLE

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION ROUTINE (COR) DATA

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION, PROGRAM, 1978-1979

PROGRAM MODELS	OPTION I		OPTION 2		OPTION 4		OPTION 5	
STAFF								
% of time present								
Teacher	100		100		100		100	
Aide	55		50		58		40	
Parent Scholar (PS)	54		44		41		44	
ASSISTANCE	**AIDE**	**PS**	**AIDE**	**PS**	**AIDE**	**PS**	**AIDE**	**PS**
% of Class Assisted When Instructing	27	24	25	28	17	15	31	15
Average # of Pupils Instructed	6	5	6	6	4	3	7	3
% of Time Spent Instructing When Present In Classroom	80	86	89	88	88	83	100	73
SUBJECT (Predominant)	Reading Language Arts		Language Arts		Reading Language Arts		Reading Language Arts	
LOCATION (Group Type)	N = 79		N = 18		N = 58		N = 25	
TEACHER	Whole	42%	Small	50%	Whole	45%	Small	48%
	Small	33%	Whole	44%	Small	33%	Whole	40%
	Large	22%	Large	6%	Large	19%	Large	12
	Individual	4%			Individual	3%		
	N = 44		N = 9		N = 34		N = 10	
AIDE (When Present)	Small	73%	Small	89%	Small	65%	Small	70%
	Individual	5%			Individual	21%		
	Whole	2%			Whole	67%	Large	30%
	Other	18%	Other	11%	Other	9%		

A-5

SUMMARY TABLE

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION ROUTINE DATA

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION PROGRAM

PROGRAM MODELS	OPTION 1		OPTION 2		OPTION 4		OPTION 5	
	N = 43		N = 8		N = 24		N = 11	
PARENT SCHOLAR (when present)	Small	77%	Small	75%	Small	42%	Small	36%
	Individual	9%	Large	13%	Individual	29%	Individual	36%
	Large	5%	Other	13%	Whole	17%	Other	27%
	Other	9%			Large	4%		
					Other	8%		
	PERCENTAGE OF OBSERVATIONS							
MATERIALS								
Library center	27%		6%		9%		12%	
2+ Activity centers	62%		52%		83%		84%	
Child-made charts, graphs	6%		11%		9%		8%	
Child-made art work	71%		78%		59%		92%	
SAPA Kits	0		0		0		0	
Attendance board	8%		28%		28%		16%	
Choice board	5%		11%		14%		0	
Job Chart	19%		67%		40%		12%	
Token Menu	29%		0		0		0	
Programmed workbooks	20%		6%		38%		4%	
Games	92%		89%		86%		96%	
Ethnic materials	11%		67%		9%		68%	
Environmental projects	4%		6%		12%		20%	
Diaries	0		0		17%		0	
	AVERAGE FREQUENCY PER OBSERVATION							
TEACHER ACTIVITY								
Read	2.3		3.6		3.5		2.1	
Organized	34		22		31		40	
Questioned	34		20		28		31	
Gave information	6		3		11		8	
Approved	9		4		6		8	
Praised (specific)	12		1		1		1	
Rewarded	9		0.1		0.1		0.6	
Commented on behavior	2		2		3		2	

SUMMARY TABLE

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION ROUTINE DATA

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION PROGRAM

PROGRAM MODELS	OPTION I	OPTION 2	OPTION 4	OPTION 5
CHILDREN'S ACTIVITY				
Responded to Teacher Questions	40	28	30	36
PERCENTAGE OF OBSERVATIONS				
Wrote an original piece	3	11	12	4
Read silently or aloud	49	17	43	32
Measured or compared	5	0	7	4
Observed events or objects	5	0	7	12
Classified	15	22	10	36
Applied numbers	4	0	10	0
Add, subtract, multiply, divide	19	11	10	4
Responded to IF, HOW, WHY, CONDITIONAL questions	35	17	19	0
Talked to other children (approved)	11	6	28	0

A-7

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY

Follow Through Expansion Program

Parent Involvement Data

TOTAL NUMBER OF SITES	28
NUMBER OF SITES RESPONDING	26
NUMBER OF SITES WITH PROGRAM SPECIFIC PARENT GROUPS	2
NUMBER OF SITES WITH HOME/SCHOOL ASSOCIATIONS	24
NUMBER OF FAMILIES WHOSE CHILDREN ATTEND PROGRAM	6647

TYPE OF INVOLVEMENT	# OF PARENTS VOLUNTEERING	# OF HOURS
ADMINISTRATIVE/CLERICAL WORK	145	2239
CLASS PARTICIPATION	519	30175
CLASS TRIPS	330	3678
WORK DONE AT HOME	377	3561
FUND-RAISING WORK	277	6015
OTHER TYPE ACTIVITIES	25	4939

PARENT INVOLVEMENT WORKSHOP DATA

TYPE OF WORKSHOP	MAN-HOURS	NUMBER OF WORKSHOPS	ATTENDANCE AT WORKSHOPS	WORKSHOP HOURS
EDUCATION	14,639	217	3269	775
POLICY PLANNING	335	12	120	35
SOCIAL SERVICES	754	21	288	50
HEALTH AND NUTRITION	613	24	242	61
CAREERS: JOB TRAINING	116	5	71	10
PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,959	56	719	140
OTHER	795	22	285	56
TOTALS	19,211	357	4,994	1,127

APPENDIX C

TABLE 1

Follow Through Expansion Program

Amount of Different Types of

Staff Development Received By

Teachers (T) and Aides (A)

Teachers N = 64 Aides N = 30

Type of Staff Development	1-5 Times		6-10 Times		Over 10 Times		None	
	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A
# OF WORKSHOPS ATTENDED	58	23	27	43	12	23	2	3
# OF CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATIONS RECEIVED	69	57	8	23	5	13	6	7
	1-15 Times		16-30 Times		Over 30 Times		None	
	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A
# OF GROUP MEETINGS ATTENDED	62	53	17	23	11	17	8	39
# OF INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES RECEIVED	63	53	24	17	12	13	5	7
# OF INFORMAL COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED	47	43	22	23	17	17	6	3
# OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED	47	63	22	10	38	13	5	7

TABLE 2

Follow Through Expansion Program

Percentage of Teachers (T) and Aides (A) Expressing

Satisfaction With Services Provided By Resource Personnel

Service	Satisfied	
	T	A
CONDUCTS WORKSHOPS	94	97
CONDUCTS GROUP MEETINGS	15	100
INFORMS YOU OF PROGRAM INFORMATION, DECISIONS AND PROCEDURES	91	93
LOCATES AVAILABLE RESOURCE MATERIAL	97	13
ON-SITE CLASSROOM TRAINING	72	83
GIVES SUPPORT TO INDIVIDUAL CONCERNS	91	97
OFFERS SUPPORT IN WORKING WITH PARAPROFESSIONALS	85	97
OFFERS SUPPORT IN PARENT INVOLVEMENT	87	90
ARRANAGES USE OF PROFESSIONAL DAYS	62	77
GIVES SUPPORT IN WORKING OUT CONCERNS ABOUT INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN	77	97
GIVES SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTIVE USE OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS	94	93
GIVES SUPPORT IN SOLVING CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS	77	93

Table 3

Follow Through Expansion Program

Percentage of Teachers (T) and Aides (A) Indicating

the Extent To Which Staff Development Received Had Helped

Them Do A Better Job in the Classroom

AREA OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	EXTENT OF CHANGE					
	LITTLE		MODERATE		GREAT	
	T	A	T	A	T	A
SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	30	20	45	50	9	27
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	23	17	36	43	28	30
USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	25	10	31	33	22	40
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	31	30	38	47	11	27
COMMUNITY RESOURCES	27	23	39	30	9	23
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	30	17	37	47	22	23
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	23	17	42	40	19	30
MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	28	13	27	43	20	37
MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	20	13	36	37	17	37
HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	25	17	36	40	11	30
IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILLS READINESS	17	7	39	47	25	40
LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	23	23	42	33	17	37
INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	22	17	41	40	19	40
LEARNING DISABILITIES	30	30	30	33	8	23
SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	22	30	19	33	6	23
USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	28	30	41	27	17	17
SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION	22	13	41	27	22	0
USING PARAPROFESSIONALS	25	10	25	23	31	57

Table 4

Follow Through Expansion Program

Number of Teachers (T) and Aides (A)

Preferring Areas Listed for Future Staff Development

AREA OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	PREFERRED	
	T	A
SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	28	46
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	41	33
USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	31	27
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	12	17
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	27	47
MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	33	17
MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	33	17
HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	33	30
IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILLS READINESS	44	47
LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	27	21
INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	36	30
LEARNING DISABILITIES	39	30
SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	14	20
INTEGRATION	12	3
SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION	20	40
USING PARAPROFESSIONALS	30	37
USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	30	13

TABLE 5

Follow Through Expansion Program

Percentage of Teachers (T) and Aides (A) Willing

To Participate in Staff Development After School Hours

Without Reimbursement

AREA OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	WILLING	
	T	A
SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	11	30
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	14	27
USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	23	37
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	6	20
COMMUNITY RESOURCES	9	17
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	20	33
MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	16	13
MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	3	13
HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	14	27
IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILLS READINESS	14	17
LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	11	3
INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	5	30
LEARNING DISABILITIES	20	27
SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	14	20
USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	19	13
SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION	11	27
USING PARAPROFESSIONALS	9	20

APPENDIX D

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

TABLE 1

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION

NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Total Enrollment	Number of Children Observed/Screened	Number of Children Receiving Mental Health Services
7000	372	372

TABLE 2

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION

FREQUENCY OF CONSULTATION AND
RELATED MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

Classroom Observations	Direct Services			Indirect Services		
	Direct Consultations					
	Children	Parents	Staff and Other	Referrals	Staff Development and Parent Workshops	Planning/ Faculty Meetings
95	185	99	588	31	50	63

TABLE 1

Follow Through Expansion
Health Services

Program Enrollment	Epsdt* Eligible		Physical Examinations		Completed Screening							
					Vision		Hearing		Growth		Dental	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
7000	689	10	1661	24	4796	69	4338	62	3574	51	NR[2]	

[1] only partial data was reported

[2] NR = not reported

TABLE 2
Identified Problems

Problems	Found Through Screenings	Referred		Under Care or Care Completed	
	N	N	%	N	%
Vision	660	628	95	278	44
Hearing	138	129	93	65	50
Growth	261	152	58	24	16
Medical[1]	596	502	84	202	40

1. This reflects the number of problems identified through physical examinations.

TABLE 3

Identified Problems

PROBLEMS	FOUND THROUGH SCREENINGS	REFERRED		UNDER CARE OR CARE COMPLETED	
	N	N	%	N	%
VISION	259	204	79	89	44
HEARING	69	67	97	32	48
GROWTH	111	82	74	54	66
DENTAL	NR*	NR		162**	

* NR = not reported

** Dental reports were received from 6 of the 14 Original Follow Through Schools.